



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,062	11/30/2000	Paul W. Dent	4015-721	2720
24112	7590	10/11/2007	EXAMINER	
COATS & BENNETT, PLLC			POLTORAK, PIOTR	
1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Cary, NC 27518			2134	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/727,062	Applicant(s)	DENT, PAUL W.
Examiner	Peter Poltorak	Art Unit	2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5, 7-12, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5, 7-12, 14-15, 17-18 and 20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment received on 4/05/07 has been entered.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but not found persuasive.

Applicant's amendment addressed the objections cited in the previous Office Action.

As result, the objections cited in the previous Office Action are withdrawn.

3. *Applicant argues that rather than authenticating a password entry screen to a user, Pichlmaier discloses a data exchange to mutually validate remotely located computers, which applicant suggests, read on validating the entire computer system.*

The examiner points to Pichlmaier's col. 2 lines 17-32, which clearly disclose authentication indicia authenticating the password entry screen to a user.

4. *Applicant argues that Pichlmaier does not disclose storing authentication indicia in a secure memory and supports its allegation by suggesting that Pichlmaier teaching of randomly generated numbers and enciphering techniques.*

The examiner points out that (even though memory in Pichlmaier's is a secure memory) claimed language does not include argued "secure memory".

5. *Applicant suggests that there is no motivation to combine Pichlmaier and Windows NT because, "the plain fact that terminating the programs as taught in Windows NT and Ozzie means terminating the very application programs needed by Pichlmaier to function".*

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive. Windows NT discloses halting programs not needed by the security module and, similarly to Pichlmaier's disclosure, the security module does not halt programs used to facilitate the authentication process.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-15, 17-18 and 20

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-15, 17-18 and 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pichlmaier (U.S. Patent No. 5317637) in view of *Windows NT as illustrated by Ozzie (U.S. Patent No. 5664099) and Hadfield et al. (Lee Hadfield, Dave Hater, Dave Bixler, "Windows NT Server 4 Security Handbook", 1997, ISBN: 078971213)*.

As per claims 1 and 11, Windows NT discloses authentication password entry screen, receiving a command to execute a password-protected secure function (Hadfield, "The Log-On process", pg. 80-81) that temporarily halts execution of programs not needed by a security module while the data entry screen is displayed and restarts halted programs after the password entry screen is removed from the display prompting a user to enter a password (Ozzie, col. 1 lines 51- col. 2 line 1). An ordinary artisan would appreciate that devices utilizing Windows NT systems comprise memory and processors.

8. Windows NT does not teach storing authentication indicia for authenticating password entry screens to a user in a memory of the computing device. Pichlmaier discloses a device comprising a secure processor and memory storing authentication indicia (data word, Pichlmaier, col. 2 lines 17-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement the indicia for authentication password entry screen to a user in a memory of the computing device. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to verify the authenticity of the device system (Pichlmaier, col. 1 lines 38-46). Similarly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Windows NT teaching into the device disclosed by Pichlmaier given the benefit of establishing a protected channel between a user and legitimate programs and terminate any hostile programs (e.g. Trojan horses, eavesdropping programs etc., Ozzie, col. 1 lines 46-67).
9. As per claims 2 and 4, the indicia stored in the device module is obtained from a user (col. 2 lines 29-31) and as per claims 12 and 20, Pichlmaier discloses a removable smart card (Pichlmaier, Fig. 1).
10. As per claim 3, it is clear the indicia taught by Pichlmaier reads on confidential data. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to display the indicia for a limited time in order to prevent unnecessary exposure and as a result minimize threats of attacks.

11. As per claims 5, 7-8 and 14-15, as discussed above, Windows NT discloses halting any application programs which are in operation during the password entry sequence and after the information has been entered correctly the operating system returns control to the application. This reads on halting executing of programs running on the computing device not necessary for inputting the password while the password entry screen is displayed, inhibiting an operating system in the computing device from responding to interrupts not associated with the security module and inhibiting context-switching by an operating system in the computing device to programs not needed by the security module.

12. As per claims 9-10 and 17-18, Windows NT does not explicitly teach a status table in RAM that is used by an operating system in the computing device, wherein each entry in the tables relate to a currently executing program and containing a status indication associated with the currently executing program, saving current setting of the status table and changing the current setting so as to inhibit execution by the operating system of the programs not needed by the security module. However, utilizing tables to store and retrieve related information are well-known in the art of computing (see previously provided to applicant Carter's reference: Fig. 21-9 pg. 795). Utilized data structure to store data such as program status information would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention given the benefit of table structure commercial success.

The name of a table (e.g. a status table, an alternate status table) would not affect functionality of the invention especially since the claim language does not preclude a status table to be different from an alternate status table.

Furthermore, grouping information by common characteristics in different tables would have been an obvious variation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to group similar information in the same table (e.g. information relating to a currently executing program in a status table, information relating to programs needed by security module in another table). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to a quick access to related information.

13. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-11 and 14-15 and 17-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozzie (U.S. Patent No. 5664099).

As per claims 1, 11 Ozzie discloses authentication indicia known to a user for authenticating password entry screens to the user (Fig. 2A-C, col. 3 lines 49-67 and col. 8 lines 65-67). Ozzie explicitly discloses that the apparatus implementing the indicia is a computer with memory (col. 3 lines 8-15) and computers inherently store data such as display data in memory.

Furthermore, Ozzie discloses Windows NT, wherein Ozzie discloses receiving a command to execute a password-protected secure function (Control-Alt-Delete) that temporarily halts execution of programs not needed by a security module while the data entry screen is displayed and restarts halted programs after the password entry

screen is removed from the display prompting a user to enter a password (Ozzie, col. 1 lines 51- col. 2 line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate Windows NT halting and restarting execution of programs not needed by a security module as disclosed by Windows NT given the benefit of establishing a protected channel between a user and legitimate programs and terminate any hostile programs (e.g. Trojan horses, eavesdropping programs etc., Ozzie, col. 1 lines 46-67).

The examiner reminds applicant that in Windows NT, "the particular key sequence during information (password) entry" discussed by Ozzie is an authentication function executing the password-protected secure function based on the validity of the password entered by the user (for additional information see Hadfield reference for example: "The Log-On Process", pg. 80-81).

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to remove data entry screens after successful authentication process in order to enable the authenticated users to access their desktop. Note that such a mechanism is frequently implemented in the prior art, e.g. Microsoft products such as Windows NT.

14. As per claim 3, Ozzie clearly discloses removing the entry screen (Fig. 2A-C) would remove the indicia. Furthermore, it is clear from Ozzie's disclosure that indicia is confidential data displayed during the authentication process to authenticate the screen. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of applicant's invention to display the indicial for a limited time to prevent any security attacks.

15. As per claims 5, 7-8 and 14-15, as discussed above, Ozzie discloses halting any application programs which are in operation during the password entry sequence and after the information has been entered correctly the operating system returns control to the application. This reads on halting executing of programs running on the computing device not necessary for inputting the password while the password entry screen is displayed, inhibiting an operating system in the computing device from responding to interrupts not associated with the security module and inhibiting context-switching by an operating system in the computing device to programs not needed by the security module.

16. As per claims 9-10 and 17-18 Ozzie does not explicitly teach a status table in RAM that is used by an operating system in the computing device, wherein each entry in the tables relate to a currently executing program and containing a status indication associated with the currently executing program, saving current setting of the status table and changing the current setting so as to inhibit execution by the operating system of the programs not needed by the security module.

However, utilizing tables to store and retrieve related information are well-known in the art of computing (see previously submitted to applicant Carter's reference: Fig. 21-9 pg. 795). Utilized data structure to store data such as program status information would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention given the benefit of table structure commercial success.

The name of a table (e.g. a status table, an alternate status table) would not affect functionality of the invention especially since the claim language does not preclude a status table to be different from an alternate status table.

Furthermore, grouping information by common characteristics in different tables would have been an obvious variation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to group similar information in the same table (e.g. information relating to a currently executing program in a status table, information relating to programs needed by security module in another table). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to a quick access to related information.

17. Claim 4 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozzie (U.S. Patent No. 5664099) in view of Cottrell (U.S. Patent No. 5465084).

Ozzie discloses authentication credential: indicia, as discussed above.

18. Ozzie does not teach that obtaining the credential from users.

Cottrell discloses obtaining the authentication credential from users (Cottrell, col. 4 lines 16-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to obtain the authentication credential from users as disclosed by Cottrell.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to use authentication credential easily remembered by the users.

19. Claim 2 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozzie (5664099) in view of Bertina (U.S. Patent No. 6091817).

Ozzie discloses a device for executing a password-protected secure function comprising a secure processor and memory as discussed above.

20. As per claim 2, Ozzie does not explicitly disclose storing the indicia in a security module.

Bertina discloses storing data in a security module (Bertina, col. 2 lines 7-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to store such as indicia in a security module as disclosed by Bertina. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to restrict access to the data.

21. Claim 11 and 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozzie (5664099) in view of Challener (U.S. Patent No. 6598032).

Ozzie discloses a device for executing a password-protected secure function comprising the processor and the memory as discussed above.

22. Ozzie do not disclose the device comprising a smart card containing the processor and the memory.

Challener discloses a removable smart card containing a processor and memory (Challener, col. 2 lines 6-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement the processor and the memory disclosed by Ozzie into a removable smart card as disclosed by Challener. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to extend security into the Challener's card.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Poltorak whose telephone number is (571) 272-3840. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



10/04/07



KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER